



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

TS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,225	06/12/2001	Tomasz J. Goldman	08204/8201348-000	7562
38878	7590	11/13/2006	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 5257 NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257			BHATIA, AJAY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	
DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>09/881,225</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>GOLDMAN ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Ajay M. Bhatia</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2145</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ruberg (U.S. Patent 6,895,588).

For claim 1, Ruberg teaches, a method comprising:

detecting attachment of a shared resource to a server;

querying if the shared resource is associated with a share indicator stored at the server;

(Ruberg, Col. 5 lines 16-40)

applying share allocation defined by the share indicator if the share indicator is present the server; (Ruberg, Col. 5 lines 60-67, Col. 6 lines 16-26, Col. 7 lines 14-26)

and if the shared resource is unassociated with the share indicator, automatically

creating a share file at the server that enables identification and automatically allocating

Art Unit: 2145

sharing of the unassociated shared resource. (Ruberg, Col. 6 lines 46-57, Col. 7 lines 14-26)

For claim 4, Ruberg-Elteto teaches, the method of Claim 1 further comprising: creating a share indicator on the shared resource if the share indicator is not present. (Ruberg, Col. 6 lines 46-57, Col. 7 lines 14-26)

Claims 7, 10, 13, and 19 list all the same elements of claims 1, 4, teaching the same invention. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1, 4 applies equally as well to claims 7, 10, 13, and 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruberg (U.S. Patent 6,895,588) in view of Elteto (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0043702).

Art Unit: 2145

For claim 2, Ruberg fails to clearly disclose, the method of Claim 1 wherein querying further comprises; determining if a share directory is present on the shared resource; and determining if a share file is in the share directory.

Elteto teaches, the method of Claim 1 wherein querying further comprises; determining if a share directory is present on the shared resource; (Elteto, paragraph 71) and determining if a share file is in the share directory. (Elteto, paragraph 71)

Both Elteto and Ruberg are in the field of interacting with USB devices. (Elteto, paragraph 23) and (Ruberg, Col. 4 lines 42-49)

Elteto is compatible with Ruberg because Ruberg allows for permission for the devices (Ruberg, Col. 2 lines 11-22) and Elteto provides a more advance permission system (Elteto, paragraph 24)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the system of Elteto and Ruberg, allows the system to become secure as possible with the use of personal keys. (Elteto, paragraph 24)

For claim 3, Ruberg-Elteto teaches, the method of Claim 2 wherein queuing further comprises; determining if a checksum file exists in the share directory; (Elteto, paragraph 66, part of MD5) and validating a checksum in the checksum file. (Elteto,

Art Unit: 2145

paragraph 66) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 3.

For claim 5, Ruberg-Elteto teaches, the method of Claim 4 wherein creating comprises: creating a share directory on the shared resource; (Elteto, paragraphs 71, 77) and creating a share file in the share directory. (Elteto, paragraphs 71, 77) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 5.

For claim 6, Ruberg-Elteto teaches, the method of Claim 5 wherein creating further comprises: creating a checksum file in the share directory; (Elteto, paragraph 66, part of MD5) and writing a checksum in the checksum file. (Elteto, paragraph 66) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 6.

Claims 8-12, 14-18, and 20 list all the same elements of claims 2-6, but in system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 2-6 applies equally as well to claims 8-12, 14-18, and 20.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Notice of references cited (if appropriate).

Art Unit: 2145

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M. Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



AB



Jason Cardone
Supervisor Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145